

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/788,617                              | 02/27/2004     | Antony Cozart Parsons | 82274.98            | 6489             |
| 24347 7                                 | 590 08/10/2004 |                       | EXAM                | INER             |
| HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP 1601 BRYAN STREET |                |                       | SHAH, K.            | AMINI S          |
| ENERGY PLAZA - 30TH FLOOR               |                |                       | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| DALLAS, TX                              | 75201          |                       | 2863                | -                |

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Office Action Summan   | 10/788,617  | PARSONS ET AL.   |  |  |   |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |   |
|  | Kamini S Shah   | 2863   |  |  |   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |  |  |   |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |   |
| Status   |   |  |  |  |   |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ju   | ne 2004.  |  |  |  |   |
|  |   |  |  |  |   |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |   |  |  |  |   |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45  | 53 O.G. 213.   |  |  |   |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |  |  |  |   |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.  |   |  |  |  |   |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  | vn from consideration.  |  |  |  |   |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |  |  |  |   |
| 6) Claim(s) 1-18,20,22-24,26,27,29-31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.   |   |  |  |  |   |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19,21,25, 28, 32</u> is/are objected to.   |   |  |  |  |   |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  | election requirement.   |  |  |  |   |
| Application Papers   |   |  |  |  |   |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   | г.  |  |  |  |   |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.   |   |  |  |  |   |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |  |  |  |   |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti  | on is required if the drawing(s) is obj   | ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |   |
| 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | aminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |   |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |  |  |  |   |
| 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |   |  |  |  |   |
|  |   |  |  |  | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |  |  |  |   |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |  |  |  |   |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of  | of the certified copies not receive   | d.   |  |  |   |
| Attachment(s)  |   |  |  |  |   |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary  | (PTO-413)  |  |  |   |
| 2) Dotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Da   | ite  |  |  |   |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:   | atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |   |

Application/Control Number: 10/788,617

Art Unit: 2863

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

### Double Patenting

- 1. Claims 1 and 27 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 9 and 33. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). The only difference between claims is the difference in the wording such as power flow vs. energy flow, however both claims cover the same thing.
- 2. Applicant is advised that should claims 1 and 27 be found allowable, claims 9 and 33 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).
- 3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2863

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18,20,22-24,26,27,29,30,31,33-35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 9-15, 32-35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,075, and over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,178. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: estimating direction to a disturbance source in a power system comprising a voltage transducer, a current transducer and disturbance energy or power determination circuitry. The only difference between the claims in present application and claims in patent '075 is that patent claims includes additional feature such as voltage/current transducers are electro-magnetically coupled to power system (i.e. claim 32 vs. claim 1 in present application), and logic circuit comprises dedicated circuitry (i.e. claim 4 vs. claim 17 in present application), and similarly claims 9-15 vs. claims 27 and 33 of present application. Additionally, the only difference between the claims in present application and claims in patent '178 is that patent claims includes additional feature such as weight factor and producing results combined with weight factor. However, with the omission of these features in the claims at present application, remaining elements perform the same function as before. Therefore omission of

Application/Control Number: 10/788,617

Art Unit: 2863

reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1, 9, 17, 27, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright et al (4,499,417).

Regarding to claimed invention, Wright et al discloses the apparatus that determines direction from which the disturbance is traveling, the apparatus includes voltage and current transducers within apparatus 8, and teaches to monitor the transducer outputs and to store the signals for a period corresponding to the duration of one whole or half cycle of the power system, see col. 4, lines 21-30. Furthermore, Wright discloses the calculation using voltage and current and determines the proportions of the energy in the disturbance, see col. 6, lines 39-50 and col.6-22. Additionally, Wright et al discloses the polarity detectors 45 for checking sign of the quantity and determining the direction of the disturbance originates from the point to a right of the monitoring point or to the

Art Unit: 2863

left of the monitoring point, such as claimed front of or the behind of the disturbance locating apparatus, see col. 7, lines 38-52.

## Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 19,21,25,28, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kamini S Shah whose telephone number is 571-272-2279. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kamini S Shah Primary Examiner Art Unit 2863